D R A F T

Fort Albert J. Myer
Consolidated Utility Systems Privatization
Environmental Assessment

March, 2000

Attachment to Request For Proposal
for the Privatization of the
National Capital Region
Utility Distribution and Collection Systems
Solicitation DACA31-00-R-0026

Note: This file includes text only for the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Ft. Myer UDC Systems Privatization. Information for Appendix A – Agency Coordination, Appendix B – General Installation Maps, Appendix C – UDC System Maps, and Appendix D – Transformer Inspection and Test Reports is provided as a separate file attachment to this Solicitation.

Prepared By:
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Baltimore District

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This Environmental Assessment (EA) examines the proposed privatization of selected utility distribution and collection (UDC) systems at Fort Myer, Arlington County, Virginia, following the Department of Defense (DoD) and Department of the Army (DA) directives and guidance to military installations. DoD and DA envision that the Government will be able to divest itself of the ownership and responsibility to operate and maintain UDC systems on military installations by contracting with a non-Federal entity. The Military District of Washington (MDW) has decided to pursue this privatization initiative by grouping selected UDC systems at each of its five installations in the National Capital Region (NCR), and combining all grouped systems into one public solicitation. At Fort Myer, the utilities selected for the grouped contract are the electric, water and wastewater (Myer UDC) systems. Fort Myer's natural gas distribution system has already been privatized. MDW's decision to group the NCR UDC systems for privatization is the result of preliminary market research and conditions inventories at each of the five installations. These investigations have led to the conclusion that the responsibility to own, operate, and maintain unprofitable or marginally profitable systems would not be enticing to a non-Federal entity without proper incentives. The best incentive that MDW has envisioned, maximizing the extent of privatization, is to group all types of UDC systems from a number of locations into one package that combines the more potentially profitable utility systems with the less potentially profitable systems.

Actions Analyzed

Four alternatives were considered for this project. Alternatives for the proposed action include (1) Out-source Operation and Maintenance of the Myer UDC Systems, (2) Privatization Restricted to the Current Alignments of the Myer UDC Systems, (3) Unrestricted Privatization of the Myer UDC Systems, and (4) the No-Action Alternative.

Alternative 1 would outsource the operation and maintenance of the Myer UDC systems. The Government would retain ownership of the real property infrastructure and would continue to be responsible for any capital improvements to the systems. Adoption of Alternative 1 would not satisfy the need to provide immediate and future capital improvements to UDC systems in poor condition, nor would it fully comply with DoD and DA policy to divest Government ownership and operation of these systems.

Alternative 2 would privatize the Myer UDC systems by means of fee simple transfer of current real property infrastructure to the non-Federal entity via a Bill of Sale or deed transaction. Additionally, an easement would be granted to the same entity for means of access along the current utility alignments, and a 10 to up to 50-year utility services contract would be awarded to transfer responsibility for maintenance and operation of these systems from the Government to the successful non-Federal entity. Adoption of Alternative 2 would restrict the non-Federal entity from proposing infrastructure construction and improvement activities outside the limits of the easement granted; therefore, no new work could be conducted on lands that potentially have not

already or recently been disturbed by human activities. It should be noted that adoption of Alternative 2 would allow the non-Federal entity to proceed expeditiously with infrastructure improvement activities within the limits of the easements to be granted upon contract award. However, possible monetary and operational efficiencies that could be achieved by the realignment of obsolete utility lines would not be realized. The potential benefit of initial project timesaving is not expected to outweigh these considerable opportunity costs.

Alternative 3 would privatize the Myer UDC systems as in Alternative 2 above, except that no restrictions would be placed on the non-Federal entity to propose infrastructure construction or improvement activities outside the limits of easements to be granted for existing UDC systems. The non-Federal entity would be responsible to operate and maintain the UDC systems to industry or other standards as prescribed in the utility service contract. Should the non-Federal entity propose to replace part or all of an existing UDC system or systems, by realignment or relocation outside of the easement to be granted at contract award, the non-Federal entity would be responsible for all associated environmental compliance, permits, installation approvals, and local regulatory requirements. The non-Federal entity must fund these associated activities and complete them prior to initiation of any physical work. Adoption of Alternative 3 would allow the most unrestricted competition among offerors, encouraging the submission of proposals with the most efficient and cost-effective infrastructure improvement plans to serve the current and expected installation utility service needs. As Alternative 3 best positions MDW to be able to pursue DoD and DA UDC system privatization goals, it is designated as the preferred action alternative.

Alternative 4, the no-action alternative, is the baseline against which the proposed action was evaluated, as prescribed by Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations. The baseline established to evaluate the environmental and socioeconomic effects of the proposed action would be the conditions at Fort Myer in the absence of the proposed action. Adoption of the no-action alternative would continue the Government's present ownership and responsibilities to operate and maintain the existing UDC systems. Maintenance and operational trends would most likely remain the same. This alternative would not satisfy the need to provide near-term capital improvements to existing systems in poor condition, nor would it comply with DoD and DA policy on obtaining cost-effective and efficient utility services. Therefore, this alternative is not preferred.

Environmental and Socioeconomic Consequences

Table ES-1 shows the expected impacts for the preferred action and no-action alternatives analyzed in detail in this EA. The following paragraphs provide additional information on expected impacts. The proposed action to privatize the ownership, operation and maintenance of the Myer UDC systems would not be expected to have any significant adverse effects on any environmental resources or socioeconomic conditions on this installation. Furthermore, the proposed action would not be expected to significantly change the overall mission of Fort Myer, or by itself lead to an increase, decrease, or change in the number or types of tenants on the installation.

Granting utility easements and transferring the real property infrastructure would be expected to result in minimal cumulative physical, biological or chemical effects on any resource of the installation, and on installation command or mission. The only foreseeable effects of the proposed action on these resources are secondary and short-term, specifically as a result of potential future excavation and construction activities by the non-Federal entity or its subcontractors that would be associated with repairing, upgrading or constructing new UDC systems. The following segments address these potential effects.

Potential utility infrastructure improvements, including expansion, repair or upgrade of the UDC systems, would most likely have minimal impact on air, land and water resources. These effects are not likely to be large, either singly or cumulatively. Additionally, restrictions and conditions incorporated into the easement would require special care and responsibilities for environmentally sensitive areas, mitigating any foreseeable impacts to (1) water supply and quality, (2) prime farmland soils, (3) forest conservation areas, (4) aquatic resources, (5) wetlands, (6) threatened and endangered species, and (7) cultural resources. This reduction of the impact of each part of the proposed action would reduce the overall cumulative impact of all foreseeable activities within reasonable limits. The non-Federal entity would be responsible for ensuring that future construction, maintenance, and upgrades of the utilities comply with all applicable Federal and state environmental laws and regulations.

Regulatory Requirements

Compliance with Federal environmental regulations would be required before the project analyzed in this EA could be initiated. The status of environmental compliance for the installation is summarized in Table ES-2.

Conclusions

Upon reviewing the EA and other information, implementing the preferred alternative for the proposed action addressed in this EA would not significantly alter baseline environmental or socioeconomic conditions. Because the proposed action would not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment, no environmental impact statement will be prepared, and a Finding of No Significant Impact will be published in accordance with 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1500 and Army Regulation (AR) 200-2.

Table ES-1: Summary of Effects of the Proposed Action and the No-Action Alternative		
Resource	**Proposed Action**	**No-Action Alternative**
Land Use	No Impact.	No Impact.
Geology	No Impact.	No Impact.
Soils	No Impact.	No Impact.
Topography and Drainage	No Impact.	No Impact.
Climate	No Impact.	No Impact.
Air Quality	No Impact.	No Impact.
Water Quality	No Impact.	No Impact.
Aquatic Resources and Wetlands	No Impact.	No Impact.
Vegetation	No Impact.	No Impact.
Wildlife Resources	No Impact.	No Impact.
Threatened and Endangered Species	No Impact.	No Impact.
Prime and Unique Farmlands	No Impact.	No Impact.
Wild and Scenic Rivers	No Impact.	No Impact.
Cultural Resources	No Impact.	No Impact.
Hazardous, Toxic and Radioactive Substances	No Impact.	No Impact.
Infrastructure	No Impact.	No Impact.
Solid Waste	No Impact.	No Impact.
Transportation	Temporary, minor impacts.	No Impact.
Economics	Minor impacts.	No Impact.
Public Health and Safety	No Impact.	No Impact.
Noise	No Impact.	No Impact.
Environmental Justice	No Impact.	No Impact.

Table ES-2: Compliance with Federal Environmental Statutes and Executive Orders[a]

Acts	Compliance[b]
Anadromous Fish Conservation Act	FULL
Clean Air Act, as amended (Public Law 88-206)	FULL
Clean Water Act, as amended (Public Law 95-217)	FULL
Coastal Barrier Resources Act	FULL
Coastal Zone Management Act	FULL
Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986	FULL
Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Public Law 93-205)	FULL
Estuary Protection Act	FULL
Federal Water Project Recreation Act	FULL
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended (16 United States Code [U.S.C.] 661, et seq.)	FULL
Land and Water Conservation Fund Act	FULL
Marine Mammal Protection Act	FULL
Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act, as amended (Public Law 94-265)	FULL
National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190)	Ongoing
National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (Public Law 89-665)	Ongoing
Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended	FULL
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (Public Law 94-580)	FULL
Rivers and Harbors Act	FULL
Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended (Public Law 93-523)	FULL
Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, as amended	FULL
Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-469)	FULL
Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954 (16 U.S.C. 1101, et seq.)	FULL
Wetlands Conservation Act (Public Law 101-233)	FULL
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act	FULL

[a] Applies to all alternatives.

[b] Ongoing—Some requirements of the regulation remain to be met before implementing some activities. Full compliance is expected.

Table ES-2, continued:
Compliance with Federal Environmental Statutes and Executive Orders[a]

Executive Orders	
Flood Plain Management (Executive Order 11988)	FULL
Protection of Wetlands (Executive Order 11990)	FULL
Federal Compliance with Pollution Standards (Executive Order 12088)	FULL
Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (Executive Order 12898)	FULL
Invasive Species (Executive Order 13112)	FULL

[a]Applies to all alternatives.

[b]Ongoing—Some requirements of the regulation remain to be met before implementing some activities. Full compliance is expected.

D R A F T

Attachment to Solicitation DACA31-00-R-0026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section **Page**

This page intentionally left blank.

1.0 PURPOSE, NEED AND SCOPE

1.1 Background

The great majority of the nation's military installations contain Government owned, operated and maintained utility distribution and collection (UDC) systems. In many instances, funding for maintenance and operation of UDC systems has not kept pace with the functional needs of these systems, especially those that have exceeded or are now approaching the end of their expected useful life. Privatization of the UDC systems on military installations entails the transfer of infrastructure ownership, operation, maintenance, repair and replacement responsibilities from the Government to a private or public sector utility services provider. Privatization of the UDC systems is envisioned as the means for the military services to obtain the most efficient and effective delivery of utility services to standards applicable and prescribed for systems in the private sector. Privatization of UDC systems would allow the military services to redirect specific manpower resources to meet the critical needs of its core war fighting, training, support, and readiness missions.

Congressional legislation and subsequent Department of Defense (DoD) Defense Reform Initiatives Directives (DRIDs) and Department of the Army (DA) implementation policies directed that military installations pursue privatization of all their UDC systems. Enacted in November 1997, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (10 U.S.C. 2688) provided authority to the Secretary of a military department to convey a utility system, or part of a utility system, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, to a municipal, private, regional, district, or cooperative utility company or other entity. The conveyance may consist of all right, title and interest of the United States in the utility system or such lesser estate, as the Secretary considers appropriate, to serve the interests of the United States. DoD issued Defense Reform Initiative Directive (DRID) #9, Privatizing Utility Systems, on 10 December 1997. DRID #9 directed the military services to develop plans to privatize all applicable UDC systems by 1 January 2000. In subsequent DRID #49, issued on 23 December 1998, DoD relaxed the privatization deadline to 2003 for the great majority of military installations where privatization efforts had not yet been undertaken. Exceptions were strictly limited to those cases where a particular UDC system must be maintained for unique national security reasons or where privatization of a particular UDC system is ultimately determined to be uneconomical.

Following DA policy for implementing these DRIDs, the U.S. Army Military District of Washington (MDW) is seeking to privatize thirteen (13) selected UDC systems at its five (5) installations in the National Capital Region (NCR) by the end of September 2000. MDW's five installations in the NCR are Fort Lesley J. McNair, located in Washington, D. C.; Fort George G. Meade, located in Maryland; and Fort Myer, Fort Belvoir, and Fort A.P. Hill, all located in Virginia. Importantly, Fort Lesley J. McNair and Fort Myer, although in two different governmental districts, are in close proximity in the Washington D. C. metro area. As a result, many activities at these two installations are jointly managed, and resources are shared to enjoy economies of scale on a variety of activities, including facilities planning and management. They form the Fort Myer/McNair Military Community (FMMC).

This Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared to address the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of the proposed action to privatize, as a group, the electric, water and wastewater UDC systems at Fort Myer (Myer UDC systems). Fort Myer is located in Arlington County in northern Virginia, across the Potomac River from the District of Columbia. Arlington National Cemetery borders the eastern edge of the property. Interstate 66 is just to the north of the fort, and Interstate 395 is to the south. A map, depicting the general location of Fort Myer, is provided at Appendix B, Figure 1: Location of Fort Myer. A more specific, larger scale map of the installation is provided at Appendix B, Figure 2: Installation Map. Fort Myer's natural gas distribution system has already been privatized.

1.2 Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

The purpose of the proposed action is to transfer infrastructure ownership from the Federal Government to a non-Federal entity, conveying responsibility to renovate, repair, replace, operate and maintain these systems to prescribed industry standards, common in the private sector. The physical condition of one or more of the UDC systems at Fort Myer is such that all or parts of the systems are approaching or have exceeded their expected useful life. Funding for maintenance, repair and upgrade of these systems provided by DA over the years has generally not kept pace with the need to adequately maintain the infrastructure integrity and reliability of these systems.

MDW seeks to implement the proposed action by means of best value competitive award of a contract to a successful, non-Federal offeror. The utility service contract, issued in accordance with the current Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) statute for a period of up to fifty (50) years, would prescribe the performance standards for the operation, repair, maintenance and replacement of the UDC systems. Additionally, in conjunction with the award of this contract, two real estate contracts would complete the privatization of the UDC systems. The ownership of the UDC systems' infrastructure would be transferred in full by deed or bill of sale to the successful offeror. To allow the successful offeror access to the infrastructure to accomplish work under the service contract, the Federal Government would grant easements to the land immediately surrounding the existing UDC systems.

MDW, as the major Army command ultimately responsible for overseeing all activities at Fort Myer and the sponsor of the recent utility privatization studies for the command, has proposed consolidating the privatization of thirteen (13) selected UDC systems at its five NCR installations as the best means for implementing DoD and DA privatization policy. The three (3) Myer UDC systems would be included in this grouping as part of the overall MDW privatization initiative. One or more of the UDC systems at Fort Myer, if pursued separately for privatization, might not be economically viable for takeover by prospective offerors given the specifics of the systems' present condition, routing, and customer base. The utility systems located at the other four NCR installations, presumed to possess greater potential profitability, would be combined with these systems, envisioned as having less potential profitability. Although the systems at Fort Myer might require more resources than can be gained, the overall benefits of the consolidated project would entice offerors to accept this partial loss. By implementing this innovative approach to privatization, MDW seeks to cultivate an apparent, growing competitive interest in the non-Federal sector for this potential business opportunity, setting an example for more than 1000 potentially applicable UDC systems DoD-wide.

Since prospective offerors would be able to bid on the consolidated UDC systems at one, several or all of the MDW NCR installations, separate EAs are being prepared for each of the five installations regarding this proposed action, and emphasize the environmental consequences to that specific installation. This EA supports the privatization effort at Fort Myer only. At first glance, this approach could be perceived as segmentation. However, after careful consideration, separating the environmental assessments was deemed appropriate and prudent for several reasons. First, that already alluded to, the contract itself could be awarded to one, two, three, four or five offerors. In essence, the Request for Proposals could result in a segmented contract award. Secondly, each of the installations, although under the command of MDW and located in the National Capital Region, are geographically separated and distinct. Three major, national political boundaries are crossed. Moreover, the utility systems to be privatized are isolated and different at each installation. Negative, cumulative environmental impacts from one to another are not anticipated. The environmental consequences are expected to occur only at a local level. Therefore, this approach serves the spirit of the National Environmental Protection Act and provides the project the flexibility it could require.

1.3 Scope of Analysis

This EA was developed in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), implementing regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and Army Regulation (AR) 200-2, *Environmental Effects of Army Actions*. Its purpose is to inform decision-makers and the public of the likely environmental and socioeconomic consequences of the proposed action and alternatives.

The EA identifies, documents and evaluates the potential environmental and socioeconomic effects associated with the proposed action to implement DoD and Army privatization policy at Fort Myer. Section 2.0 describes the proposed action. Section 3.0 sets forth alternatives to the proposed action, including a no-action alternative, and explains why certain alternatives will not be evaluated in detail. Section 4.0 describes the existing environmental conditions at Fort Myer that fall within the scope of this EA. Section 5.0 describes the environmental and socioeconomic consequences envisioned by adoption of either the proposed action or the no-action alternative. Section 6.0 presents the conclusions and findings.

An interdisciplinary team of environmental scientists, biologists, ecologists, planners, economists, engineers, historians, and military technicians has reviewed the proposed action and the alternatives in light of existing conditions and has identified relevant beneficial and adverse effects associated with the action. The EA focuses on effects likely to occur within the area of proposed action (i.e., the installation boundaries). The document analyzes direct effects (those resulting from the proposed action and occurring at the same time and place) and indirect effects (those resulting from the proposed action and occurring later in time or those farther removed in distance, but still reasonably foreseeable). The potential for cumulative effects is also addressed, and mitigation measures are identified where appropriate.

1.4 Public Involvement

MDW invites public participation throughout the NEPA process. Consideration of the views and information of all interested persons promotes open communications and enables better decision-making. All agencies, organizations and members of the public having a potential interest in the proposed action are urged to participate.

Public participation opportunities with respect to the proposed action evaluated in this EA are guided by AR 200-2, *Environmental Effects of Army Actions*. Upon final review and concurrence with this environmental assessment's findings that the proposed Federal action would not be expected to result in significant environmental effects, Fort Myer would issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI). The public and concerned organizations would be informed of the FNSI and the availability of the EA by the publishing of a Notice of Availability (NOA) in local newspapers. For a period of thirty (30) days, starting with the day that the NOA is advertised, concerned organizations and the public would be encouraged to submit comments on the proposed action, the EA, and the FNSI. Work on the proposed action will not commence until this timeframe is observed and any resulting issues resolved. At any point in the process, the public may obtain information on the status and progress of the proposed action and the EA by contacting the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, Planning Division point of contact Mr. David Hand, telephone (410) 962-8154.

1.5 Framework for Analysis

A decision on whether to proceed with the proposed action rests on numerous factors, such as the Army's changing mission requirements, the successful completion of the privatization contracting process, availability of funding, determination of economic viability, and environmental considerations. In addressing environmental considerations, MDW and Fort Myer are guided by several relevant statutes and implementing regulations and by Executive Orders that establish standards and provide guidance on environmental and natural resource management and planning. These include, but are not limited to, the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, Farmland Protection Policy Act, National Historic Preservation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, Executive Order *11988 (Floodplain Management*), Executive Order 11990 (*Protection of Wetlands*), Executive Order *12088 (Federal Compliance with Pollution Control Standards*), Executive Order 12898 (*Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*), and Executive Order 13045 (*Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*). Where useful to better understanding, key provisions of these statutes and Executive Orders are described in more detail in the text of the EA. Table 1-1, provided below, summarizes the installation's current compliance status with these environmental statutes and Executive Orders.

Table 1-1: Compliance with Federal Environmental Statutes and Executive Orders[a]

Acts	Compliance[b]
Anadromous Fish Conservation Act	FULL
Clean Air Act, as amended (Public Law 88-206)	FULL
Clean Water Act, as amended (Public Law 95-217)	FULL
Coastal Barrier Resources Act	FULL
Coastal Zone Management Act	FULL
Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986	FULL
Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Public Law 93-205)	FULL
Estuary Protection Act	FULL
Federal Water Project Recreation Act	FULL
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended (16 United States Code [U.S.C.] 661, et seq.)	FULL
Land and Water Conservation Fund Act	FULL
Marine Mammal Protection Act	FULL
Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act, as amended (Public Law 94-265)	FULL
National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190)	Ongoing
National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (Public Law 89-665)	Ongoing
Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended	FULL
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (Public Law 94-580)	FULL
Rivers and Harbors Act	FULL
Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended (Public Law 93-523)	FULL
Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, as amended	FULL
Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-469)	FULL
Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954 (16 U.S.C. 1101, et seq.)	FULL
Wetlands Conservation Act (Public Law 101-233)	FULL
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act	FULL

[a] Applies to all alternatives.

[b] Ongoing--Some requirements of the regulation remain to be met before implementing some activities. Full compliance is expected.

Table 1-1, continued:

Compliance with Federal Environmental Statutes and Executive Orders[a]

Executive Orders	
Flood Plain Management (Executive Order 11988)	FULL
Protection of Wetlands (Executive Order 11990)	FULL
Federal Compliance with Pollution Standards (Executive Order 12088)	FULL
Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (Executive Order 12898)	FULL
Invasive Species (Executive Order 13112)	FULL

[a] Applies to all alternatives.

[b] Ongoing--Some requirements of the regulation remain to be met before implementing some activities. Full compliance is expected.

2.0 PROPOSED ACTION

MDW and Fort Myer propose to implement DoD and DA directives and policy to privatize its electric, water and wastewater UDC systems at Fort Myer. The privatization of these systems would be carried out through two steps, a real estate transaction and a service contract. The real property assets associated with the UDC systems infrastructure would be transferred to a non-Federal entity through a bill of sale or deed and access to the land on which the real property is situated would be granted to the same non-Federal entity by a perpetual easement. Additionally, a 10 to up to 50-year utility service contract would be awarded in accordance with the current FAR. MDW and Fort Myer seek one qualified non-Federal entity, regulated or unregulated, to own, operate, and maintain these three UDC systems at Fort Myer. MDW and Fort Myer have arranged with the Baltimore District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, to be the contracting agent for implementing the proposed action.

Implementation of the proposed action would represent the Government's preferred alternative for privatization of its Myer UDC systems. Other alternatives are presented in Section 3.0.

This EA was prepared to describe the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of privatizing the existing UDC systems at Fort Myer. The relevant, current environmental conditions of the real property that would be transferred and the land associated with the known easement areas that would be conveyed are discussed herein. Upon contract award, it would become the responsibility of the non-Federal entity to initiate action to bring all UDC systems into compliance with the general and specific industry performance standards that would be identified in the contract. Importantly, the non-Federal entity would be permitted to propose replacement of all or parts of one or more existing UDC systems or the installation of new or extended utility services that could be run in alignments outside the easement limits issued at time of contract award. A very general discussion of the potential impacts of such proposals is included in this EA as part of the Cumulative Impacts in Section 5.11. It would be incumbent, however, on the non-Federal entity to perform or obtain, at their expense, any necessary studies, assessments and documentation and approvals required prior to performing work outside the areas covered in this EA. This would include executing activities to comply with NEPA, and other federal, state and local government laws, codes and regulations, including permits. Clauses, conditions and restrictions in the real estate documents and the utility service contract would be included to assure that the non-Federal entity is responsible.

3.0 ALTERNATIVES

The Government has identified three alternatives for its proposed action, as well as the no-action alternative. These alternatives are discussed below.

3.1 Out-Source Operation and Maintenance of Myer UDC Systems

Under this alternative, the Government would out-source only the functions of operation and maintenance of the Myer UDC systems. The Government would retain ownership of the UDC systems infrastructure.

Since no asset ownership would be transferred, no financial leverage or other investment incentive is included in this alternative. The out-source contractor could not and would not be required to provide the necessary, near-term and long- term, major capital improvements to the UDC systems infrastructure that is in poor condition or in need of total replacement. This alternative would maintain the process of annual budget requests from the installation to the MACOM, DA and Congress for needed physical improvements. This status quo situation has proven to be unsuccessful consistently in the past and detrimental to the viability of the utility systems. Congress, by enacting the legislation to authorize the Secretary of a Military Department to privatize all utility systems, has recognized this problem. Additionally, adoption of this alternative would not comply with the DoD and Army directives to divest Government ownership of UDC systems. It does not privatize the systems. For these reasons, this alternative is does not fully comply with the purpose and need criteria for the proposed action and, as a result, will not be addressed further.

3.2 Privatization Restricted to the Current Alignments of the Myer UDC Systems

Under this alternative, the Government would implement privatization of its Myer UDC systems described under the proposed action, but would restrict the non-Federal entity to effect repair, rehabilitation, replacement or other infrastructure improvements to the UDC systems as currently aligned and within the easements to be issued upon contract award.

The Government has determined that adoption of this alternative would unduly restrict potential offerors from proposing what they determined to be the most efficient and economic means to improve existing infrastructure. Offerors would be precluded from proposing relocated or new routes for UDC systems outside the limits of easements to be granted based on current UDC system alignments. MDW and Fort Myer believe that, given the opportunity, offerors would consider proposing new or relocated UDC systems alignments, especially for those systems considered in need of total or major replacement. One goal of the privatization process is to maximize infrastructure upgrades or other improvements as part of achieving efficient, safe reliable utility service to installation customers at the lowest cost. Most importantly, proposals to conduct work outside the existing utility routes would be considered under the proposed action, a newly proposed action that would required its own process to comply with NEPA and other environmental laws and regulations. Safeguards, in the form of contract clauses and easement

conditions and restrictions, requiring the privatization entity to be responsible for this compliance work would be placed in the appropriate proposed action documentation. For these reasons, this alternative is not reasonable at this time and not ripe for examination further in this EA.

3.3 Unrestricted Privatization of Myer UDC Systems

Implementation of the proposed action, as described in Section 2.0, would represent the Government's preferred alternative for privatizing its remaining three UDC systems under Government control at Fort Myer. Accordingly, the environmental and socioeconomic consequences of the preferred alternative are evaluated in detail in Section 4.0 of this document.

3.4 The No-Action Alternative

This document refers to the continuation of existing conditions of the affected environment, without implementation of the proposed action, as the no-action alternative. The Council on Environmental Quality requires inclusion of the no-action alternative. The no-action alternative serves as the baseline against which the proposed action and alternatives can be evaluated.

Under the no-action alternative, the Government would retain ownership of the three remaining UDC systems at Fort Myer and would continue to be responsible for operating and maintaining those systems with its FMMC Directorate of Public Works and Logistics (DPWL) workforce. Maintenance and operational practices would most likely remain the same. Fort Myer would continue to obtain funding for the management of the utility systems through the congressional authorization and appropriations process. Any major changes to or construction of utility improvements would require that appropriate NEPA analyses are completed prior to implementing such actions.

Selecting the no-action alternative would not satisfy the need to provide immediate capital improvements to those existing systems or portions of systems in poor condition. Furthermore, it would not comply with DoD directives and Army policy to privatize UDC systems. Therefore, the no-action alternative is not preferred.

4.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

4.1 Project Area Description

4.1.1 Land Use

Existing land use patterns at Fort Myer are provided in Table 4-1. Currently, about half, approximately 155 acres of a total of 256 acres, of Fort Myer has been developed. The remaining area is used primarily as parade grounds and recreational open space.

Table 4-1: Existing Land Uses

LAND USE CATEGORY	APPROXIMATE ACREAGE	% OF TOTAL
OPEN OPERATIONAL AREAS		
Ammunition Storage	0.7	0.3
Parade Ground	16.3	6.4
BUILT-UP CANTONMENT AREAS		
Administration	8.1	3.2
Community Facilities	36.8	14.4
NCO Family Housing	7.9	3.1
Officer Family Housing	16.4	6.4
Troop Housing and Support Facilities	44.9	17.5
Unaccompanied Officer Housing	3.4	1.3
Medical	6.0	2.3
Recreation	84.8	33.1
Service and Storage	28.0	10.9
Training	2.7	1.1
Total	**256.0**	**100.0**

SOURCE: Fort Myer, Draft Existing Conditions EA, July 1991.

4.1.2 Geology

Fort Myer is located within the Coastal Plain Province and is situated on river terrace deposits that average 25 to 30 feet in thickness. These deposits consist of gravel, sand and silt underlain by unconsolidated clay, silt and sand of the Coastal Plain. In the Fort Myer area, depth to igneous and metamorphic bedrock is between 49 and 123 feet (Fort Myer, Draft Existing Conditions EA, 1991).

4.1.3 Soils

Soil characteristics within the installation are described as Coastal Plain sediments consisting of non-consolidated clays, silts and sands that are underlain by depositional deposits of sand and gravel (Fort Myer, Draft Existing Conditions EA, 1991). Soils are moderately well drained, with some seasonally wet zones occurring in low-lying areas. No detailed soil surveys have been completed for Arlington County or Fort Myer (Fort Myer, Draft Existing Conditions EA, 1991).

4.1.4 Topography and Drainage

Fort Myer occupies a nearly level plateau of land, bounded by steeper sloping draws and drainage ways. The topography of the site and the surrounding area is typical of the Coastal Plain and is gently rolling with only moderate relief. Elevations range from 55 feet above mean sea level (msl) at the Marshall Drive entrance on Arlington Ridge Road to 235 feet above msl on the parade grounds. The entire site drains east and south toward the Potomac River. All of the natural drainage systems have been altered and modified by human activity. Although they no longer resemble their pristine natural condition, these drainage systems still continue to convey excess surface water from the site.

4.1.5 Climate

Observational records regarding climate have been kept continuously at the Washington Reagan National and Dulles Airports and at locations near the District of Columbia since November 1870. Because of its proximity to Fort Myer, the following climatic data from the Washington Reagan National Airport collection point is referenced below (Fort Myer, Draft Existing Conditions EA, 1991).

The average daily maximum and minimum temperatures for 1990 were 66.5°F and 48.5°F, respectively. The average annual precipitation is 39.00 inches. The maximum monthly rainfall was 14.31 inches in August 1955 and the maximum rainfall in a 24-hour period was 7.19 inches in June 1972. Thunderstorms occur approximately 30 days out of the year, 22 of which occur in the months of May through August. Snowfall or ice accumulation of at least 1 inch occurs about 5 days each year. The maximum monthly accumulation was 30.6 inches in February 1979. The prevailing direction of the wind is from the south and average wind speed is 9.4 miles per hour (Fort Myer, Draft Existing Conditions EA, 1991).

4.2 Air Quality

The climatic factors that occasionally cause increased air pollution in the Washington area are usually low mixing, light winds, and a high-level temperature inversion. These inversion conditions are closely monitored in the winter months for carbon monoxide (CO) levels. During the months of April through October, levels of ozone (O_3) also are monitored. Pollutants are usually well mixed throughout a fairly deep layer of air and are seldom at hazardous concentrations.

Monitoring of air quality around Fort Myer is under the jurisdiction of the Arlington County Environmental Health Department and Region VII of the Virginia Air Pollution Control Board. Fort Myer is located in the National Capital Interstate Air Quality Control Region, which has been designated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as non-attainment for nitrous oxides (NO_x), O_3 (rated as serious), and CO (rated as moderate) (Fort Myer, Draft Existing Conditions EA, July 1991). For "serious" O_3 non-attainment areas, a "major source" is defined, for regulatory purposes, as any source (Fort Myer being defined as a single "source" of air pollution) with the *potential* to emit 50 tons per year (TPY) of NO_x or volatile organic compound (VOCs). The source of this serious rating has been identified as nearby Reagan National Airport**.** Sources in ozone non-attainment areas with *actual* emissions greater than 25 TPY of either VOCs or NO_x are required to submit Emissions Statements annually. There are no reporting requirements for “moderate” non-attainment. Fort Myer must also comply with the

provisions of the Emissions Statement requirements outlined by the Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Environmental Quality.

4.3 Water Quality

4.3.1 Surface Water

Fort Myer is situated approximately two (2) miles west of the Potomac River and is in the Potomac River watershed. The river is considered a significant aquatic resource in the Washington area for commerce and recreation and has shown improvement in water quality over the last 10 years. Recent data indicates that ortho-phosphate and total phosphorus concentrations have decreased, effluent oxygen demands have decreased, submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) has increased, and a general decrease in bacterial levels has occurred. (Fort Myer, Draft Existing Conditions EA, 1991)

There is one unnamed tributary located along the southwestern boundary of Fort Myer which contributes flow into the Potomac River system via Long Branch and Four Mile Run, both of which are located south of the installation. The tributary according to a 1991 survey revealed that it is approximately 15 feet wide and 1.5 feet deep during base-flow conditions. Incoming flows from a large culvert at the southwest installation entrance have eroded the stream banks and formed a broad pool. The water was clear, but no aquatic biota was observed in either the riffle or pool areas of the stream. No water quality studies or biological inventories have been performed on the unnamed tributary (Fort Myer, Draft Existing Conditions EA, 1991). According to the United States Geological Survey (USGS) gage (in cooperation with the Northern Virginia Planning District) the daily mean flow for Four-Mile Run is 16 cubic feet per day. Fort Myer has Storm Water Management for industrial sites. Sites greater than five (5) acres require a construction storm water permit.

4.3.1.1 American Heritage Rivers

On July 30, 1998, the Potomac River was designated an American Heritage River under the American Heritage Rivers Initiative. The Initiative is designed to help communities restore and protect their river resources in a way that integrates natural resources, economic development, and the preservation of historic and cultural values. Designated rivers will receive special recognition and focused, Federal support.

4.3.1.2 Floodplains

The 1971 Federal Insurance Administration [now Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)] Flood Insurance Study (FIS) for Arlington County places Fort Myers outside the 100-year floodplain for Long Branch and Four Mile Run (Zone C, areas of minimal flooding). The 1981 FIS for Arlington County does not include Fort Myer and the areas encompassed by Arlington Hall Reservation, the Pentagon, Washington National Airport, the Navy Annex, Arlington National Cemetery (ANC), and the U.S. Marine Memorial. The Arlington County Flood Insurance Rate Map (May 3, 1982) that corresponds to the Fort Myer vicinity characterizes Ft. Myer as a Zone D (areas of undetermined, but possible, flood hazards).

4.3.2 Groundwater

The Patuxent, Patapsco, and Magothy are the principal water bearing aquifers underlying Fort Myer. They are encountered approximately 30 feet below the surface with a probable direction of flow toward the southeast. Recharge occurs off of the installation as a result of precipitation infiltrating outcrop areas or in other sections migrating downwards through breaks in the confining beds. These local sources of ground water are not used to supply potable water to the installation because of the availability of municipal water. Only one instance of groundwater contamination is known to be occurring at Fort Myer. Recent investigations show that groundwater contamination has occurred at the Shopette Class VI Store, which stores and sells automotive gasoline. The contaminants are PCE, THP and BTEX. Fort Myer is working with the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality to assure proper use of the groundwater in the affected area. Deed restrictions on the land in the affected area are one method being employed.

4.4 Aquatic Resources and Wetlands

In addition to the surface waters identified above, Fort Myer has approximately 1.15 acres of wetlands in three separate areas on the installation property (Fort Myer, Renovation Barracks EA, March 1999). The largest of these is a Palustrine Forested Wetland approximately 1.05 acre in size, which is confined to the floodplain adjacent to the intermittent stream on the southeast corner of the installation. The remaining two areas were found east of McNair Road and totaled approximately 0.1 acres. The wetlands here are associated with intermittent water drainage that flows northeast toward Arlington Cemetery. For further wetland information, refer to Appendix B, Figure 3: Wetlands, Floodplains and Aquatic Resources.

Fort Myer is classified as a Resource Management Area (RMA) under the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation Criteria (Virginal Regulation 173-02-00, Part III). A RMA consists of land that protects the value of the Resource Protection Area (RPA), and is designated landward of and contiguous to all RPAs. If land types within a RMA are improperly used or developed, there is a potential for causing significant water quality degradation, or for diminishing the functional value of the RPA.

4.5 Vegetation

The majority of the native vegetation has been removed from Fort Myer as a result of past development and training activities. The terrestrial vegetation present on the installation consists almost entirely of landscaped trees and grasses (Fort Myer, Renovation Barracks EA, 1999). Common grasses present on the installation include Kentucky bluegrass, red fescue, perennial rye, zoysia and Bermuda maintained as turf. Some small, scattered wooded areas, which contain the natural vegetation of the region, are found on portions of the installation. Common invasive plants found at Fort Myer include wild garlic (*Allium vineale*), wild onion (*Allium canadense*), common chickweed (*Stellaria media*), crabgrass (*Digitaria* sp.), buttercups (*Ranunculus* sp.), and ground ivy (*Glecoma headeracea*) (Fort Myer, Renovation Barracks EA, 1999). Vegetation management activities include mowing, planting, fertilizing, pruning, and chemical control.

4.6 Wildlife Resources

Fauna commonly found on the installation are those adapted to an urban environment, including squirrels, chipmunks, rabbits, raccoons, garter snakes, and songbirds (Fort Myer, Renovation Barracks EA, 1999). Red fox has occasionally been sighted in the area. Warblers may use the

small wooded area near the boundary with Arlington National Cemetery during migration; however, the small size of this area precludes most from nesting. Common pests present on the installation include numerous insects, rodents, and birds (e.g., starlings and pigeons) (Fort Myer, Renovation Barracks EA, 1999). The overall integrated pest management program utilizes physical controls, inspections, sanitation, and various mechanical control procedures such as trapping and elimination of harborage.

4.7 Threatened and Endangered Species

The United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service (USF&WS) was requested by letter dated July 7, 1999 to provide information on threatened and endangered species at Fort Myer, in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Their letter response, dated July 15, 1999, stated that, "except for transient individuals, no proposed or federally listed endangered or threatened species are known to exist in the project area." A copy of the correspondence is provided at Appendix A. The Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries were contacted in conjunction with the USF&WS during preparation of the 1995 Fort Myer Master Plan, regarding the presence of rare, threatened, and endangered species in the vicinity of Fort Myer. These contacts reported that no state or other non-Federal listed species were located within the boundaries of the installation. The developed nature of the installation would normally preclude colonization by such species. However, two Federal listed species occur in the Washington, D.C. region. One, the threatened Hays Spring amphipod (*Stygobromus hayi*) is located in Rock Creek Park, within the National Zoo property, and, two, the watch-listed bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) has been known to nest in lands adjoining the Potomac River within 15 miles downstream of Fort Myer. The eagles most likely forage along the Potomac River but have never been sighted on the installation.

4.8 Prime and Unique Farmlands

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) National Resource Conservation Service has verified that no areas of prime and unique farmland are located in the vicinity of Fort Myer.

4.9 Wild and Scenic Rivers

The National Park Service has verified that no waterways in the vicinity of Fort Myer are protected under the Wild and Scenic Rivers program.

4.10 Cultural Resources

4.10.1 Previous Investigations

The Fort Myer Historic District was listed as a National Historic Landmark (NHL) in 1972. In 1991 work began on a draft Cultural Resource Management Plan (CRMP) for Fort Myer. Work on the CRMP included a detailed survey of buildings on the installation. The survey recommended an expansion of the boundary of the original NHL district. This draft CRMP was never finalized, and the results of the architectural survey were not coordinated with the Virginia State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). In 1998 an updated CRMP was prepared for the FMMC. Although this document was finalized within the Army, as of the date of this EA, review of the updated 1998 CRMP has also not been coordinated with the SHPO.

4.10.2 Archeological Resources

There are no recorded archeological sites on Fort Myer. The 1991 CRMP identified two potential archeological sites. One was a prehistoric site located in what is now a picnic area. The second site was the potential dumping site of debris related to the 1950 renovation of the White House. In 1995, during excavation for the construction of the Army-Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES) Shoppette, an archeological feature was discovered. The feature was either a large stone wall or building foundation. Plans for the construction project were altered and the feature was left intact. Due to extensive development, Fort Myer is thought to have limited potential to contain intact archeological features. There are no known archeological sites on Fort Myer that are listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places.

4.10.3 Architectural Resources

As previously stated, the Fort Myer Historic District is a NHL. There are 69 contributing buildings formally listed in the District and shown in Table 4-2. NHL designation automatically results in a listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The entire district is treated as a *de facto* historic district, as shown on Figure 4: Cultural Resources, located at Appendix B.

Table 4-2: Fort Myer Historic District, NHL Listed Buildings

Building Number	Name/Use	Date of Construction
1	General Staff Family	1899
2	General Staff Family	1899
5	General Staff Family	1903
6	General Staff Family	1932
7	General Staff Family	1909
8	General Staff Family	1903
11 A/B	General Staff Family	1892
12 A/B	General Staff Family	1892
13 A/ B	Officer Family Housing	1903
14 A/B	Officer Family Housing	1903
15 A/B	General Staff Family	1908
16 A/B	General Staff Family	1908
17	General Staff Family	1935
19 A/B	Officer Family Housing, General Staff Family Housing	1932
20 A/B	General Staff Family	1932
21 A/B	General Staff Family	1932
22 A/B	Officer Family Housing, General Staff Family Housing	1932
23 A/B	General Staff Family Housing, Officer Family Housing	1896
24 A/B	Officer Family Housing	1896
25 A/B	Officer Family Housing, General Staff Family Housing	1896, 1900
26 A/B	Officer Family Housing	1896

D R A F T

Attachment to Solicitation DACA31-00-R-0026

Building Number	Name/Use	Date of Construction
27 A/B	General Staff Family Housing	1903
28	Noncommissioned Officer Family Housing	1935
40	Garages	1938
42	Administration	1900
43	Administration	1896
45	Administration	1893
46	Administration	1893
47	Garages	1942
50	Bachelor Officers' Quarters	1906
51	Garages	1942
53	Garages	1942
54	Garages	1942
55	Scout Building	1938
56	Garages	1942
57	Garages	1932
59	Headquarters, Administration	1896
201	Photo Lab, Administration, Community Center	1893
202	Administration	1900
203	Administration	1915
214	Officers' Open Mess, Pool Showers	1896
216	Administration	1896
217	Main Post Office	1900
224	Thrift Shop	1906
225	Thrift Shop	1908
227	Garage	1904
228	Skill Development Center	1891
229	Administration	1901
230	Recreation Building	1891
231	Bowling Center, Storehouse	1896
232	Education Development Center	1896
233	Horse Stable	1896
234	Enlisted Men's Barracks	1941
236	Stables	1909
237	Fire Station	1909
238	Veterinarian, Enlisted Men's Barracks	1934
239	Veterinarian	1893
241	Gymnasium, Storehouse	1932, 1934
242	Administration	1904
243	Theater	1929

Building Number	Name/Use	Date of Construction
246	Enlisted Men's Barracks, Administration	1895
247	Enlisted Men's Barracks	1895
248	Enlisted Men's Barracks	1903
249	Enlisted Men's Barracks, Museum, Old Guard Lounge	1903
250	Enlisted Men's Barracks	1908
251	Enlisted Men's Barracks	1934

Source: *Draft Report: Fort Myer Cultural Resource Management Plan*, August 1991, pg. 41-53.

The Summerall Field and Parade Ground and the granite monument to Brigadier General Albert J. Myer were considered contributing elements in the landmark district. Also, as recommended first in the 1991 CRMP, two sets of buildings outside the NHL district were eligible for listing in the National Register. Table 4-3 identifies these properties. The Whipple Field and Whipple Field Flagpole were also considered eligible for listing in the National Register.

Table 4-3: Fort Myer Historic District, NHL Eligible Buildings

Building Number	Name/Use	Date of Construction
218	Warehouse	1876
219	Education Development Facility	1876
301	Water Distribution Building	1937
305	Administration	1899
306	Storehouse, Warehouse	1899
307	Maintenance Shop	1910
308	Administration	1899
309	Motor Repair Shop	1919
311	Auto Body Shop	1932
312	Maintenance Shops	1930
313	Heat Distribution Station, Repair Shop, Storage, Administration, Laundry	1939
316	Garages	1900
317 A/B	Noncommissioned Officer Family Housing	1900
318	Maintenance Shop	1927
321	Administration	1905
322	Administration	1939
335	Chapel	1935
426 A/B	Noncommissioned Officer Family Housing	1932
427	Noncommissioned Officer Family Housing	1932

Building Number	Name/Use	Date of Construction
428	Noncommissioned Officer Family Housing	1932
429	Garage	1932
430	Garage	1932
431 A/b	Noncommissioned Officer Family Housing	1932
432 A/B	Noncommissioned Officer Family Housing	1932
435 A/B	Noncommissioned Officer Family Housing	1948
436 A/B	Noncommissioned Officer Family Housing	1934
439	Noncommissioned Officer Family Housing	1932

Source: *Draft Report: Fort Myer Cultural Resource Management Plan*, August 1991, pg. 41-53.

The original district was designated a NHL on November 28, 1972. In 1991, a draft National Register nomination form was prepared. The new form contained a discussion of each building in the original NHL district as well as a recommendation to expand the boundaries of the original district. The revised boundary included buildings in the 300 area in the northeastern portion of the installation, as well as Non Commissioned Officer (NCO) quarters along the eastern side of Sheridan Avenue. To the date of this EA, the recommendation to revise the boundaries has not been formally accepted.

4.11 Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Substances (HTRS)

4.11.1 Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) and Above-Ground Storage Tanks (ASTs)

Fort Myer manages many containers for hazardous and toxic substance storage. Containers used include drums, USTs, ASTs and cylinders, with capacities ranging from 100 to 30,000 gallons. As part of the Fort Myer, Oil and Hazardous Substance, Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures Plan, these items are periodically reviewed and potential pollution sources are identified. Thirteen (13) Spill Control Areas, encompassing twenty-six (26) buildings, have been designated. Detailed descriptions of each spill control area, including facility diagram and site-specific control procedures can be referenced in the Spill Plan.

4.11.2 Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB)

Fort Myer provided Inspection and Test Reports for seven (7) transformers located at the installation, all 13,800 volts capacity. Copies of the reports are provided at Appendix D. Of the seven, six (6) were last inspected in April of 1985. All but one of the six were considered to be contaminated but were reported to be in good overall condition. Transformer Number NTV-23 was considered to be a PCB containing transformer, but it was reported to be in good condition. The seventh transformer was last inspected in October of 1996. Testing indicated the oil level was low and that the transformer was PCB containing. A recommendation was made to replace

the transformer and a contract to do this was awarded this fall. It is not known at this time if the work has been completed.

4.11.3 Radon

Radon monitoring of Fort Myer was conducted in 1989. The Radon Monitoring Report, Phase II, for MDW's Fort Myer, Fort McNair and the former Cameron Station found radon concentrations ranging from 0.3 picocuries per liter (pCi/L) to 2.5 pCi/L. These levels were well below the hazardous action level of 8.0 pCi/L. The EPA does not require any retesting or remedial actions for radon concentration levels below 4.0 pCi/L. (Ft. McNair NCO Family Housing Renovation EA, 1998, and Ft. Myer Barracks Renovation EA, 1999).

4.11.4 Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM)

No documented post-wide survey has been conducted at Fort Myer to determine the presence and distribution of asbestos from historical practices. Currently, Fort Myer complies with all Federal and Army asbestos standards. If human exposure to ACM is discovered or is determined to be likely, the ACM is properly managed pursuant to the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (40 CFR 61, subpart M) (Ft. Myer Barracks Renovation EA, 1999).

4.11.5 Lead-Based Paint (LBPs)

No post-wide survey has been conducted at Fort Myer to determine the presence of LBP. The FMMC Directorate of Public Works (DPW) manages lead abatement on a case-by-case basis in accordance with the guidelines set forth by OSHA and FMMC (Ft. Myer Barracks Renovation EA, 1999).

4.11.6 Pesticides, Herbicides, and Fertilizers

The DPW, Operations and Maintenance Division, Quality Assurance Branch currently administers the weed control program for Fort Myer and the FMMC Environmental Division, Entomology Branch administers the pest control program. Application of herbicides is contracted to a private firm that also fertilizes the grounds. Herbicides are applied by licensed applicators. No bulk storage of pesticides or herbicides occurs on Installation property. Pesticides and herbicides used on the Installation and the amount on hand as provided by the installation as of 24 September 1999 are listed in Table 4-4 below.

Table 4-4: Pesticide and Herbicide Use and Storage at Fort Myer as of 24 September 1999

Trade Name	Type	Manufacturer Name	EPA Registration Number	Amount on Hand
Gallery Round-Up	Herbicide	Dow Elanco	62719-145	2 – 1 lb jars
Avitrol	Bird control	Avitrol	11649-7	1 – 5 lb box
Vengeance Pellets	Pesticide	Gold Crest	12455-56	None at this time
Mouse Glue Boards	Pesticide	Catchmaster	N/A	5 – boxes (75)
Bait Packs Vengeance	Pesticide	Agrevo	867-450	27 – pails (96)
DITRAC	Pesticide	Bell Lab	3240-12455	1 - 6 lb pail
QUINTOX	Pesticide	Bell Lab	3240-17-12455	1 – 5 lb pail
Maxforce	Insecticide	MAXFORCE	64248-2	25 – bags (24)
LIQUATOX	Pesticide	Bell Lab	3240-12455	2 – boxes
GLUE	Pesticide	J T Eaton	N/A	2 – cans
Drione	Insecticide	Fairfield American Corporation	4816-353	9 – 7 lb pallets
Tempo 2	Insecticide	Mobay Corporation	3125-352	1 – 1 pt
DRAX	Insecticide	R Value	44313-6	23 – 12 oz cans
Perma-Dust	Insecticide	Whitmire	499-220	8 – 1 lb
PT 280 Orthene	Insecticide	Whitmire	449-230	24 – 1 lb
PT-400 Ultraban	Insecticide	Whitmire	499-271	0
Dursban Pro	Insecticide	Dow Elanco	62719-166	30 – 16 oz
PT 515 Wasp Freeze	Insecticide	Whitmire	4499-362	80 – 14 oz
TORUS	Insecticide	Ciba	100-724	7 – boxes (15)
797-A	Insecticide	STATE	1685-53-AA	1 – 80 gr btl
75-S Orthene	Insecticide	Chevron	239-2418-1919	5 – 1 lb cans
DEMTONTC	Insecticide	ZENACA	10182-107	1 – box (4)
PT 270	Insecticide	Whitmire	499-147	18 – 2 lb cans
PT 270	Insecticide	Whitmire	499-147AA	1 – 15lb can
Insect Tape	Insecticide	RAINBOW	8730-49-13283	1 – CS
PT 3 6 10	Insecticide	Whitmire	499-221	36 – 16 oz cans
OFTANOL	Insecticide	MILES	3125-342	1 – 2.5 gal
MAXFORCE Roach Gel	Insecticide	MAXFORCE	64248-5	5 – box (20)
MAXFORCE Roach Bait Stations	Insecticide	MAXFORCE	64248-1	3 – bags (72)
Roach Traps	Insecticide	Woodstream	47629-PA-01	4 – boxes (150)
ROZOL	Pesticide	Chempar	7173-113	4 – 25 lb pails
BAIT Blitz	Pesticide	J T Eaton	56-54	2 – 5 gal pails
Contrac Bait Block	Pesticide	Bell Lab	12455-79	4 – 18 lb pails
Rat Glue Boards	Pesticide	Catchmaster		3 – boxes (60)
Bait Blocks	Pesticide	J T Eaton	56-42	4 – 9 lb pails
Mouse Bait Stations	Pesticide	J T Eaton	N/A	2 – boxes (50)
Rat Traps				
Mouse Traps	Pesticide	Woodstream	N/A	1 – box (72)

4.11.7 Storage of Hazardous Materials

4.11.8 Contaminated Areas

Soil contamination was identified at two sites on Fort Myer in the vicinity of Buildings 447, 448 and 468, as shown on Figure 5 (Ft. Myer Barracks Renovation EA, 1999).

4.12 Infrastructure

4.12.1 Electrical Distribution System Description and Requirements

4.12.1.1 Current Service Arrangement

Fort Myer currently purchases electricity from Virginia Power (VP) under the Rate Schedule MS – Federal Government Installations, through a single main substation at 13.8 kV. The Fort Myer main substation consists of 13.8 kV metal-clad switchgear housed in Electrical Substation, Building 215. The substation is supplied from three (3) VP underground feeders (Feeders #891, #896 and #907). The switchgear assembly consists of eight (8) primary circuit breakers, arranged in split bus configuration, and related metering and relaying equipment. The substation provides control and over-current protection for four (4) 13.8 kV underground feeders. The proposed action would not include the procurement of electricity and would not, therefore, affect the current electricity contract with VP.

4.12.1.2 Electrical Distribution System

The Fort Myer substation is composed entirely of underground facilities and utilizes duct/manhole type construction practices. The primary system utilizes a loop configuration containing approximately 55,400 feet (10.5 miles) of underground conductor. Service transformers consist of both exterior pad mount type equipment and interior, secondary unit, substation type equipment. A number of areas of the electric distribution system may require replacement, improvement and upgrade to conform to commonly accepted industry standards and practices, such as the National Electric Code (NEC).

4.12.1.3 Electrical System Requirements

Implementation of the proposed action would make the non-Federal entity responsible to manage the operation, maintenance, repairs, replacement, extension and/or removal of all or portions of the electrical distribution system to ensure adequate and dependable electric service is distributed to each Government or tenant connection within the installation premises. The non-Federal entity would assume ownership at the point of attachment on the eight circuit breakers in the main substation.

4.12.1.4 Transmission Voltage / Demarcation Requirements

Transmission voltage would continue to be distributed throughout the installation for transformation to a primary voltage of 13.8 kV. The non-Federal entity would be responsible for ensuring proper distribution of primary voltage for final transformation to typical operating

voltages of 120, 208, 277/480 V single- and three-phase at 60 Hz for each building or facility served. The Government would retain the responsibility at the service entrance (weather-head typically) for all aerial services up to and including the main breaker (disconnect or panel) within a building on the secondary side. Electrical distribution systems within the boundaries of the Arlington National Cemetery (ANC) are not included in the proposed action, and shall remain the responsibility of the Government.

4.12.2 Potable Water Utility Distribution System Description and Requirements

4.12.2.1 Current Service Arrangements

The Fort Myer potable water distribution system consists exclusively of a water line distribution system. No on-site water treatment facilities exist. Fort Myer is supplied with potable water by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Washington Aqueduct Division (Dalecarlia), and during emergency situations Arlington County, Virginia Department of Public Works. The potable water distribution system is owned and maintained by Fort Myer. Potable water is delivered to Fort Myer at two (2) delivery points. One delivery point is not utilized and is a standby connection point. Potable water is delivered to the active delivery point at Pump Station, Building #301. The annual potable water requirement for FY 1997 at Fort Myer was estimated at 169,600 Kgal. Implementation of the proposed action would not include the procurement of the commodity or the delivery of potable water. Potable water distribution systems within the boundaries of ANC are not included in the proposed action, and shall remain the responsibility of the Government.

4.12.2.2 Potable Water Distribution System

The potable water distribution lines from the two delivery points are cast iron except where replacements have been made of ductile iron. There are approximately 51,000 feet of water lines, 200 valves and 76 hydrants in the distribution system. Water system pressure is approximately 55 pounds per square inch on average but ranges between 45 and 60 pounds per square inch. The elevated water storage tank provides system pressure and water storage for both normal use and fire protection. The water storage tank has a 500,000-gallon capacity and was refurbished in 1998.

4.12.2.3 Potable Water System Requirements

Implementation of the proposed action would require the non-Federal entity to operate and maintain the Fort Myer potable water distribution system in accordance with the State of Virginia and other applicable health, safety, environmental and operational laws, regulations or standards. The non-Federal entity would be responsible to modify its service practices as required when applicable Federal, state or local laws, regulations or standards are changed or new ones are placed into effect. The total potable water demand will also include fire protection. The required fire demand at Fort Myer is for a single fire, four (4) hours in duration, requiring 1,500 gallons of water per minute in addition to 50 percent of the peak domestic flow that could occur during an emergency.

4.12.2.4 Service Laterals

Implementation of the proposed action would include service laterals as part of the potable water distribution system to be transferred. Service laterals are defined as the smaller-diameter (normally 2-inch or less) lines that connect each building to the upstream distribution mains. The distribution mains are the larger-diameter (normally greater than 2-inch) lines. Service laterals extend to the cutoff valves of the building served by the lateral. The Government would retain responsibility for the lines, starting at the other side of the cut-off valves for the building to the interior of the structure.

4.12.3 Wastewater Utility Collection System Description and Requirements

4.12.3.1 Current Service Arrangements

The Fort Myer wastewater utility system consists exclusively of a collection system and three (3) lift stations. The installation does not own or operate any sewage treatment facilities. Arlington County, Virginia Department of Public Works, treats all sewage generated at Fort Myer. The northern portion of Fort Myer's collection system flows into ANC. The southern portion of the collection system flows into Henderson Hall, an U.S. Marine Installation. Both portions eventually enter the Arlington County collection system and treatment facilities. Fort Myer's estimated total wastewater collection for FY 1997 was 156,150 Kgals. The proposed action would not include the procurement of wastewater treatment and would not, therefore, affect the current wastewater treatment agreement with Arlington County, Virginia. ANC is not included in the implementation of the proposed action, and all facilities entering ANC will be retained by ANC at the Fort Myer-ANC boundary.

4.12.3.2 Wastewater Collection System

The Fort Myer wastewater collection system dates back to the 1950's when the installation was constructed. The pipe material is either terra cotta, concrete, High Density Poly-Ethylene (HDPE), or Poly-Vinyl Chloride (PVC). Recent repairs and replacements have been made with PVC. The wastewater collection system consists of approximately 39,850 feet (7.55 miles) of pipe and approximately 221 manholes. The pipes range in size from 12 inches to less than 4 inches with the most common size of 8 inches. There are three (2) exterior lift stations. The first one is located near Building 270; the second one is located near Building 243; and, the third one is located near Building 411.

4.12.3.3 Wastewater Collection System Requirements

Implementation of the proposed action would require that the non-Federal entity operate and maintain the Fort Myer wastewater collection system in accordance with State of Virginia and other applicable Federal and local, health, safety, environmental, and operational laws, regulations, or standards. The non-Federal entity would be responsible to modify its service practices as required when applicable Federal, state or local laws, regulations, or standards would be changed or new ones are placed into effect.

4.12.3.4 Service Laterals.

Implementation of the proposed action would include service laterals as part of the wastewater collection system to be transferred. Service laterals are defined as the smaller-diameter (normally 6-inch or less) lines that connect each service building to the wastewater force mains. The collection mains are larger-diameter (normally greater than 12-inch) lines. Service laterals extend to the exterior walls of the building served by the lateral.

4.12.4 Telecommunications

Telephone service at Fort Myer is provided by Bell Atlantic Telephone. The system is a mainframe interconnecting facility owned and operated by Bell Atlantic. The telephone system is adequate for present use and is expanded, upon request, to meet additional equipment or use requirements (Ft. Myer Barracks Renovation EA, 1999).

4.12.5 Solid Waste

Domestic refuse is placed in designated dumpsters on the installation and is collected daily by a private contractor. Solid wastes are deposited at approved sanitary landfills. Horse manure accumulated at the stables on the installation is collected, removed, and transported to a certified landfill or burn center by a private contractor. A pilot recycling program was initiated during the fall of 1989 and expanded in June 1990 to cover all activities at Fort Myer. The MDW Resource Recovery and Recycling Program (RRRP) collects non-hazardous and non-precious materials such as metal, paper, and aluminum (Ft. Myer Barracks Renovation EA, 1999).

4.12.6 Traffic and Transportation

Fort Myer is surrounded by a number of major arterial and freeway systems. The northern and northwestern boundary of Fort Myer is adjacent to Arlington Boulevard (U.S. Route 50). Another major artery, Washington Boulevard (Route 27) runs along the southwestern portion of the installation. The Shirley Memorial Highway (Interstate 395) runs north to south near the southeastern portion of the installation, and Interstate 66 runs east to west near the northwestern boundary of the installation. The main entrance and most heavily used access to Fort Myer, Hatfield Gate, can be accessed from the northbound lanes of Washington Boulevard via the Second Street overpass. This overpass leads directly to Hatfield Gate. Arlington Boulevard northbound provides a second entrance to the installation at Henry Gate, the original primary entrance to Fort Myer. The primary installation roads are Marshall Drive, Sheridan Avenue, Jackson Avenue, and Henry Place. These are the thoroughfares providing access to the installation and connecting the major land use areas. The secondary road network is composed of Sherman Road, Custer Road, Lee Avenue, McNair Road, Wainwright Road, Pershing Drive and Carpenter Road. The regional sub-way and bus systems, Metrorail and Metrobus, serve Fort Myer directly. The metropolitan area Metrorail system has a number of stations within the Fort Myer vicinity, all located within ½ to 1½ miles of the installation. A connector Metrobus from the Courthouse Metro Station is available for commuters. Fort Myer is also part of the MDW bus service, which shuttles employees between MDW operations. Direct air access to Fort Myer is not available for fixed-wing aircraft. Two, visual-approach, limited-use helicopter landing zones are located on the installation, one near Tencza Terrace and the other at Summerall Field (Ft. Myer Barracks Renovation EA, 1999).

4.13 Socioeconomic Conditions

4.13.1 Demographics

As shown in Table 4-5, the 1990 population of Fort Myer and the surrounding areas was 94,306 (Fort Myer Barracks Renovation EA, 1999). In 1998, the total Arlington County population was estimated to be 187,100 persons, an increase of 9.5% from the 1990 population of 170,936. The at place employment level of the County during weekday work hours was estimated to be 198,400 in 1998. The Fort Myer Military Garrison is located in the heart of the nation's capital. The Garrison is located across the Potomac River from Washington DC, and is adjacent to Arlington National Cemetery and the Pentagon. A number of heavily traveled Interstate Highways, and Boulevards directly border the installation. The Pentagon is located south east of Fort Myer in very close proximity to the base. The sub market of Rosslyn is located directly north of the installation, the Claredon submarket is located directly west. The community of Rosslyn, Claredon and other areas are referred to as the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor. Rosslyn is characterized by a mixture of high-rise office buildings and high-rise multi-family buildings including both condominiums and apartments developed over the past 30 years.

Fort Myer is located in Arlington County, Virginia. This twenty-six square mile county is considered to have one of the most densely populated areas in the United States. The county also has one of the most highly educated work forces in the United States. In 1996, the median household income for county residents was $55,510 per year. Approximately 20 percent of the jobs in the county are government related, with Federal employment employing forty percent of these jobs.

4.13.2 Economics

Fort Myer, as part of FMMC employs a number of civilian personnel. A number of militay personnel are also stationed at the installation. Some of the military personnel are housed within the installation or in the surrounding Washington, D.C., metropolitan area (including Washington, D.C., and suburban Maryland and Virginia). Most of the off-post personnel do not reside in the immediate area of the installation. The installation and its personnel do not receive most of their goods and services from the area surrounding the installation. The installation itself receives goods and services under contract with Federal and private regional vendors instead of by “cash and carry” exchange. Personnel have the option of seeking meals and other economic goods in the area, but the economically depressed character of the area makes such exchanges infrequent.

Soldiers stationed at Fort Myer work at locations throughout the National Capital Region. The majority of the soldiers are assigned to Headquarters Command, which comprises Fort Myer’s Military Police Company; Headquarters Company, U.S. Army; and Headquarters and Headquarters Company U.S. Army Garrison. Other tenant organizations at Fort Myer include: The 3rd U.S. Infantry; the United States Army Band; Walter Reed Medical Clinic; U.S. Army Criminal Investigation Command; Washington District; the Pentagon Operations Company; and Headquarters and Headquarters Company Information Systems Command - Military District of Washington.

The total private office space in Arlington County totaled 30.4 million square feet in 1997. Total federally owned office space as of January 1997 totaled 8.3 million square feet. There are a number of offices, hotels and malls near Fort Myer. There are estimated to be 36 hotels in the County which containing a total of 9,410 rooms. Based on 1997 estimates there are 90,151 total housing units within the County. Average sale price for single family detached house in 1997 was estimated to be $252,500.

4.13.3 Schools, Libraries, and Recreation Facilities

Public services such as schools, libraries, and recreational facilities are provided throughout the Fort Myer area. School-age family members residing at Fort Myer are currently enrolled in the Arlington County School system and attend Long Branch Elementary, Thomas Jefferson Middle School, and Washington and Lee High Schools located off-post. The Fort Myer Education Center, located in Building 219, offers college-level courses to military personnel as well as retirees and dependents on a space-available basis. The Fort Myer Library, located on-post between Sheridan Avenue and McNair Road in Building 469 and the Columbia Pike Library located off-post, serve the FMMC.

Recreational facilities located throughout Fort Myer provide activity opportunities that include swimming, tennis, racquetball, volleyball, basketball, bowling, softball, and picnicking. Outdoors recreational areas are limited because of space restrictions. A NCO Family Housing playground is located east of Tencza Terrace. Indoors physical recreation consists of the Bowling Center, the new Physical Fitness Center, a weight room in the basement of one of the barracks, and racquetball courts.

4.13.4 Public Health and Safety

The Fort Myer area is served by four fire-and-rescue stations and a police station, all located within one mile of the installation. Fort Myer operates its own fire-and-rescue service out of a facility located at Forrest Circle, across the street from Conmy Hall (Building 241). The closest off-post fire-and-rescue station is Arlington County Company 10, located approximately ½ mile west of Fort Myer on 10th Street and Arlington Boulevard. An Arlington County Police Station is located approximately ¼ mile north of Fort Myer on Clarendon Blvd. near Wilson Blvd. Police protection is provided from the Eads, South and Courthouse police stations as well as the police headquarters.

Two outpatient health care facilities serve Fort Myer: the Andrew Rader Health Clinic and the Regimental Aid Station for The Old Guard (Building 59). In addition to these on-site services, a number of medical facilities are located in the areas surrounding Fort Myer, including Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Bethesda National Naval Medical Center, Malcolm Grow U.S.A.F. Medical Center at Andrews Air Force Base, and Dewitt Army Community Hospital.

4.13.5 Noise

The major sources of noise at Fort Myer include aircraft arrivals and departures from Reagan Washington National Airport and vehicular traffic both on the installation and on adjacent streets and highways. Military helicopters and ceremonial activities also contribute to the noise level on the installation. Helicopter activities may cause short periods of speech interference both indoors and outdoors; however, helicopter noise is minimized in accordance with MDW Supplement 1 to AR 95-1, governing helicopter operations. These noise sources contribute to the background

ambient levels on the installation but do not constitute a hazard to the health of installation personnel (Fort Myer Barracks Renovation EA, 1999).

The Arlington County Noise Ordinance specifies a maximum sound level of 55 decibels for stationary noise sources in residential areas. It is estimated from available data, and from knowledge of the noise sources on the installation, that the 55-decibel criterion is met at Fort Myer. Additionally, sound levels near housing units for officers and families fall well below the upper limit of noise level guidelines, established by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for new housing locations, as well as within the EPA guidelines for residential environments.

4.13.6 Visual and Aesthetic Values

The aesthetic qualities at Fort Myer are primarily associated with the vistas of ANC, the Potomac River, and Washington, DC. In addition, the many historic structures located along tree-lined streets in the northern section of the installation further enhance its aesthetic value.

Fort Myer possesses a restricted development zone, consisting of woods, open fields, and parking lots, that was created to protect the visual integrity of ANC from any development within Fort Myer that could extend above the existing tree line and affect views of the cemetery from the east. The development-protected area extends along a shared wall between Fort Myer and ANC, from Wright Gate south to Henderson Hall. Currently, there are structures in the restricted development zone, but they are not tall enough to intrude on the view of ANC.

4.14 Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898 requires Federal agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.

For this reason, Table 4-5 presents demographic information on race, ethnicity, and poverty status in the areas surrounding Fort Myer, as a baseline on which any such effects can be identified and analyzed.

Minority and low-income families are distributed nearly evenly throughout Arlington County (Fort Myer, Renovation Barracks EA, March 1999). According to the 1990 Census, in the area surrounding Fort Myer (ZIP code zones 22201, 22204, 22206, 22209, and 22211), 30 percent of the population is non-white, 9 percent of the population is below the poverty level, and 2 percent are on public assistance.

Table 4-5: 1990 Census Figures and Economic Profile for Ft. Myer and Surrounding Area
Data for Residents Listed by Zip Code

ZIP Code	22201		22204		22206		22209		22211		AGGREGATE	
PERSONS	21999	(100%)	41490	(100%)	18172	(100%)	10155	(100%)	2490	(100%)	94306	(100%)
White	17979	(82%)	25834	(62%)	12766	(70%)	8048	(79%)	1510	(61%)	66137	(70%)
Non-White	4020	(18%)	15656	(38%)	5406	(30%)	2107	(21%)	980	(39%)	28169	(30%)
Above Poverty Level	19710	(90%)	37476	(90%)	16891	(93%)	8917	(88%)	2490	(100%)	85484	(91%)
Below Poverty Level	2289	(10%)	4014	(10%)	1281	(7%)	1238	(12%)	0	(0%)	8822	(9%)
HOUSEHOLDS	10866	(100%)	18834	(100%)	8900	(100%)	6022	(100%)	133	(100%)	44755	(100%)
Receiving Public Assistance	285	(3%)	538	(3%)	254	(3%)	32	(1%)	0	(0%)	1109	(2%)
Not Receiving Public Assistance	10581	(97%)	18296	(97%)	8646	(97%)	5990	(99%)	133	(100%)	43646	(98%)
Median Household Income	$41,490		$36,853		$45,398		$37,578		$55,628		$43,389	

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

The subsections below describe the consequences upon the natural and man-made environment associated with implementation of the proposed action. The evaluation of effects is based upon the assumption that the non-Federal entity would be responsible for ensuring that all actions or practices involving future expansion, maintenance, and upgrades of the UDC systems would comply with applicable Federal, state and local environmental laws and regulations. The no-action alternative would have no impacts to the resources presented in the subsections below.

The proposed action is envisioned as a two-part initiative. One part is the actual contractual transfer of responsibilities from the Federal Government to the non-Federal entity. Another part is the ongoing responsibility of the non-Federal entity to operate and maintain the Myer UDC systems and expand these systems as future operational needs may require. Operation and maintenance will not modify the existing capacity of the systems. Therefore, these activities essentially result in no net change to the current natural and man-made environment. Expansion, however, implies an inherent change in supplied service that is a result of an increase in demand most likely to be expected from future building construction. Expansion of the services currently provided to the installation will result in some impact to the natural and man-made environment. The magnitude of these effects can be estimated by data such as the installation's 5-year Master Plan, which will be made available to all prospective offerors.

Expansion of the existing UDC systems, if and when it occurs, would be considered a Federal action, and would first require all environmental, cultural and other coordination with the installation and MDW to be performed before initiation of any physical work. The following paragraphs address impacts associated with expected UDC system expansion in a general sense, and do not attempt to identify specific instances.

The following resources were evaluated and it was determined that the proposed action would have no impact or appreciable detrimental effect on them. Therefore, the impacts to these resources will not be addressed further by this EA.

- Land Use
- Climate
- Threatened and Endangered Species
- Prime and Unique Farmlands
- Wild and Scenic Rivers
- Telecommunications
- Solid Waste
- Potable Water
- Demographics
- Schools, Libraries and Recreational Facilities
- Environmental Justice

5.1 Project Area Description

5.1.1 Geology

No significant adverse effects upon the geologic features would be expected as a result of the proposed action. Any utility upgrades and replacement work to be performed would not involve significant, deep earthwork disturbance, and therefore would not be expected to significantly affect the geology of the area.

5.1.2 Soils

No significant adverse effects upon soils would be expected as a result of the proposed action. Future utility upgrades or replacements may temporarily effect soils within the existing easement areas. However, these soils were likely disturbed during the construction of the existing utilities, and would be subject to further disturbance in the normal course of repairing or maintaining these existing systems. Concerns regarding the protection of the integrity of surface and topsoil would be addressed during subsequent evaluation of the non-Federal entity's engineering designs. Notes that recommend the non-Federal entity installing underground utilities to sort, stockpile, and replace the top 12 inches of soil would normally be shown on the design plans or included in the special provisions of construction specifications.

5.1.3 Topography and Drainage

No significant adverse effects upon topography and drainage would be expected to occur as a result of the proposed action. Any utility upgrade or replacement may temporarily effect a small area within the existing easements, but these disturbances would be restored to their existing grades when construction is complete. Expansion of utility systems outside the existing easements is not anticipated; however, this would require further environmental evaluation if proposed in the future.

5.2 Air Quality

Implementation of the proposed action would transfer the responsibility for utilities operations from the Government to a non-Federal entity and would be expected to have no measurable impact on air quality in the Fort Myer area. Any proposed upgrade or replacement would be performed to improve efficiency, provide redundancy for safety, or as a repair. No foreseeable changes would be done to these systems in response to an increase in demand. Therefore, there would be no significant increase or decrease in air emissions in the project area as a result of the utility privatization.

5.3 Water Quality

Implementation of the proposed action would be expected to have no physical or chemical effects upon water quality resources at Fort Myer. Utility system upgrades, repairs, and replacements would not of themselves increase demand nor result in a change in water quality at the installation. Furthermore, any proposed upgrade or replacement that may have the potential to temporarily effect water quality during construction would be performed in accordance with current water quality standards and best management construction practices.

5.3.1 Surface Water

No significant adverse effects upon surface water quality would be expected to occur as a result of the proposed action. Any utility upgrade or replacement may temporarily effect the vegetation cover and soil stability within the existing easements. Therefore, exposing the site during construction could result in increased siltation in adjacent surface water features. The use of standard methods of resource protection (construction permits) and site restoration mandated by regulatory agencies will reduce the potential for degradation.

5.3.2 Groundwater

No significant adverse effects upon groundwater quality would be expected to occur as a result of the proposed action. Any utility upgrade or replacement may temporarily effect a small area within the existing easements, but these disturbances will not result in discharges which could infiltrate into subsurface reserves of groundwater and cause contamination.

5.4 Aquatic Resources and Wetlands

No significant adverse effects upon aquatic resources and wetlands would be expected to occur as a result of the proposed action. The upgrade or replacement of utilities, which occur in close proximity to aquatic resources and wetlands, will be conducted in accordance with all applicable regulatory requirements. Furthermore due to the small size and remote location of these protected resources, it is unlikely they will be affected by renovation, maintenance or repair activities.

5.5 Vegetation

No significant adverse effects upon vegetation would be expected to occur as a result of the proposed action. Any utility upgrade or replacement may temporarily effect a small area within the existing easements, but these disturbances will be restored to their existing condition when construction is complete. Foreseeable impacts on plant ecology are expected to include small-scale grass, herbaceous plants, and shrub removal and restoration. The impacts of the proposed action are not considered significant, because no unique plant habitat types are present on the installation, and the habitat requirements for the urban type of vegetation found on Fort Myer are easily satisfied throughout the installation and surrounding areas.

5.6 Wildlife Resources

No significant adverse effects upon wildlife resources would be expected to occur as a result of the proposed action. Any utility upgrade or replacement may temporarily effect a small area within the existing easements, but these disturbances will be restored to their existing condition following construction. Because none of the vegetative habitats present on Fort Myer are unique, it is expected that the few urban birds and small mammals that may be found on any construction or excavation sites would relocate quickly to similar nearby habitats.

The only foreseeable impacts could be associated with efforts requiring the removal of the existing mature trees, which are ideal habitat for forest interior dwelling birds and small mammals. Future construction activities conducted without contract provisions to retain and protect the landscape plantings may result in some localized habitat losses.

5.7 Cultural Resources

No significant adverse effects upon cultural resources would be expected to occur as a result of the proposed action. The proposed action would involve the transfer of ownership and the responsibility to operate and maintain the electric, water and wastewater UDC systems on Fort Myer. The privatization of the UDC systems would have no direct physical effects on any structure or building at the installation. The only foreseeable effects of the proposed action upon these resources are secondary, specifically the effects of anticipated construction activities conducted by the non-Federal entity responsible for the upgrading, repairing or replacing the existing utility systems.

Section 106 consultation with the Virginia SHPO has been initiated. A project initiation meeting was held in June 1999 with the SHPO and other regulatory authorities. A letter formally initiating consultation with the SHPO was sent on July 7, 1999. A follow-up letter transmitting this EA was sent to the SHPO on February 18, 2000, and requested comment on the finding of no effect of the proposed action on historic properties. The results of the consultation will be incorporated into the final version of this document.

5.7.1 Archeological Resources

Land currently occupied by the existing utility systems has been previously disturbed by the installation of the utilities and has little potential for archeological resources. Any action taken outside existing easements may impact archeological resources. Expansion of the utilities outside the existing easements could disturb any undiscovered archeological sites that may be located on the installation. Presently there are no known archeological sites on Fort Myer. Letters formally initiating Section 106 consultation with the Virginia SHPO were sent on July 7, 1999 and February 18, 2000, as described in Paragraph 5.7.

5.7.2 Architectural Resources

As described in Section 5.7, Section 106 consultation with the Virginia SHPO has been initiated. The results of the consultation will be incorporated into the final version of this document.

5.8 Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Substances (HTRS)

No significant adverse effects upon the current levels of HTRS at the facility would be expected to occur as a result of the proposed action. Furthermore, the proposed action will not be a new source of these substances and will therefore, not present a health risk to adjacent communities.

5.9 Infrastructure

5.9.1 Utilities

Prior to contract award, the existing supply and service agreements between the Government and various utility companies will need to be reviewed by the appropriate Government legal offices to ensure that they contain no clauses that would preclude or unduly hinder transfer of ownership, operation and maintenance of UDC systems under this privatization initiative. Certain existing contracts may need modification, or new contracts may need to be drafted to convey rights and easements to the Federal properties at Fort Myer. Although the full ramifications of these actions are not fully known, initial contact with representatives at Fort Myer has indicated that no issues that can not be resolved are anticipated and that preparation of an easement(s) agreement should not be encumbered by pre-existing conditions.

Under certain circumstances, utility companies may have already obtained easements to construct and maintain infrastructure within the installation boundaries, but these utilities serve specially designated installation tenants or customers at locations outside the installation boundaries. Portions of the UDC systems within these existing easements are not part of this MDW privatization initiative.

5.9.1.1 Electric

Implementing the proposed action would result in the successful non-Federal entity taking over the responsibility for the distribution system within the Fort Myer installation. This is a transfer of ownership of the distribution system only, and would not affect the procurement or delivery of the electric power commodity, which is currently provided by Virginia Power. Therefore, no significant adverse effects upon electric supply and distribution system are expected to occur as a result of the proposed action. Although maintenance, upgrade and replacement of some portions of the system is anticipated, the effort is expected to result in only temporary short-duration interruptions in service. Should they be necessary, these interruptions would be pre-arranged as a condition of the privatization agreement for low-use periods of the day when outages will affect the fewest people.

5.9.1.2 Water

No significant adverse effects upon the water supply and distribution system would be expected to occur as a result of the proposed action. Although maintenance, upgrade or replacement of some portions of the system is anticipated, the effort is expected to result in only temporary short-duration interruptions in service. Should they be necessary, these interruptions would be pre-arranged as a condition of the privatization agreement for low-use periods of the day when outages will affect the fewest people.

5.9.1.3 Wastewater

No significant adverse effects upon the wastewater collection and conveyance system would be expected to occur as a result of the proposed action. Although maintenance, upgrade or replacement of some portions of the system is anticipated, the effort is expected to result in only temporary short-duration interruptions in service. Should they be necessary, these interruptions would be pre-arranged as a condition of the privatization agreement for low-use periods of the day when outages will affect the fewest people.

5.9.2 Traffic and Transportation

No significant adverse effects upon traffic and transportation would be expected to occur as a result of the proposed action. Any utility upgrade or replacement may temporarily effect a small area within the existing easements, but these disturbances will not permanently affect local circulation routes. It can be expected that short term, minor increases in traffic volume would occur from the construction vehicles associated with utility upgrade or replacement efforts. When these efforts are complete, volumes would return to their normal levels.

5.10 Socioeconomic Conditions

5.10.1 Economics

The foreseeable economic impact of implementation of the proposed privatization initiative is expected to be minor. The Government will prepare a financial analysis of any prospective offers during the solicitation process to determine if the proposed privatization action shows a positive life-cycle cost. The non-Federal entity, awarded the utility privatization contract, will be considered owner of the Ft. Myer UDC systems. The non-Federal entity will also be financially responsible for the operation and maintenance of the systems and for implementing all necessary infrastructure repairs, upgrades or replacement work needed by the systems.

It is estimated that up to six (6) full-time equivalent (FTE's) positions in the current FMMC DPW workforce could be affected by the loss of operation and maintenance responsibilities under the proposed action. All or some of these employees could be subject to reassignment to different duties or possibly termination of employment. It is expected, however, that these employees would receive favorable consideration for employment from the non-Federal entity.

Minor economic effects associated with the proposed action may include short-term increases in construction expenditures in the area associated with Ft. Myer UDC systems infrastructure improvements or maintenance. The non-Federal entity will be able to implement infrastructure improvements sooner than the Government would be able to program and fund such initiatives. A sufficient construction labor force currently exists in northern Virginia and surrounding jurisdictions to supply the potential demand created by the proposed action without requiring construction workers to relocate from outside the metropolitan region. Secondary economic effects may include minor increases in employment and sales sectors of the economy benefiting from the existence of additional workers (for examples, restaurants, stores and gasoline stations). Direct and indirect economic effects of the potential loss of up to six (6) FTE personnel, the potential construction expenditures, and the short-term increase in construction employment are not expected to represent a significant change in the local area economy.

No significant socio-economic adverse effects or impacts are expected to occur as a result of the implementation of the proposed action. The implementation of privatization would not alter the quantity of services currently being provided to Ft. Myer.

5.10.2 Public Health and Safety

No significant adverse effects upon public health and safety would be expected to occur as a result of the proposed action. Any utility upgrade or replacement may temporarily effect a small area within the existing easements, but these disturbances will not effect public health or safety, nor the services which provide and protect public health and safety. Pedestrians and workers in proximity to construction zones will be protected by standard safety measures as specified by OSHA and other standard industry practices.

5.10.3 Noise

No significant adverse effects upon noise levels would be expected to occur as a result of the proposed action. Any utility upgrade or replacement may temporarily affect a small area within the existing easements, but these disturbances will not permanently alter noise levels at Fort

Myer. Some construction noise associated with these actions is expected, but the decibel levels will not exceed those currently detected in the vicinity of other diesel vehicles found on site such as busses, garbage trucks or delivery vans. When construction is complete the noise levels will return to their current levels.

5.10.4 Visual and Aesthetic Values

No significant adverse effects upon visual and aesthetic values would be expected to occur as a result of the proposed action. Any utility upgrade or replacement may temporarily effect a small area within the existing easements, but these disturbances will not permanently alter the visual character of the area. When restoration is complete, the character of the Installation should appear unchanged.

5.11 Cumulative Impacts

5.11.1 Impacts on the Natural Environment

The proposed action would result in the transfer of ownership of the electric, water and wastewater distribution and collection systems to the successful non-Federal entity. It would also transfer responsibility to this entity to repair, upgrade or replace the existing utilities infrastructure within an expected period of three to five years so as to be able to operate and maintain these systems to necessary, prescribed industry standards. This action would not be expected to have cumulative physical or chemical effects on any aspect of the installation, nor on installation command or mission. Foreseeable effects of the proposed action on these resources would be considered secondary, specifically the effects of temporary construction activities associated with the upgrade, repair, or replacement of all or parts of the UDC systems.

Potential, future, utility infrastructure improvements would most likely have minor and temporary impacts on soils and local air quality. These may be associated with repairing, upgrading or constructing new UDC systems, if needed. These effects would not be expected to be large, “either singly” or cumulatively. Additionally, deed restrictions that would be applied to all easements granted for existing utility lines would be expected to reduce foreseeable impacts to (1) water supply and quality, (2) aquatic resources, and (3) cultural resources at Fort Myer. This reduction of impacts would be expected to reduce the overall cumulative impact to within reasonable limits.

5.11.2 Impacts on the Human Environment

The privatization of the electric, water, and wastewater distribution and collection systems may, in the worst-case scenario, result in the loss of up to six FTE personnel from the FMMC payroll. The FMMC DPWL oversees the operation and maintenance of facilities on both Forts Myer and McNair. Full-time-equivalent personnel primarily assigned to support Fort Myer operations may be expected to either be reassigned within the DPWL workforce or be counseled as to where to apply for comparable employment, should no positions be available within the FMMC organization. It would be expected that the non-Federal entity would seek to employ those qualified individuals possessing knowledge of these systems and that any displaced individuals would have a first chance at obtaining comparable employment with no break in pay or benefits. In less than ideal conditions, some individuals would not be able to find suitable employment

within the severance period. This situation, however, would not be permanent, and the cumulative economic impacts of temporary unemployment would not likely be significant.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND FINDINGS

This EA addressed the privatization of the electric, water and wastewater utility distribution and collection (UDC) systems on the Fort Myer installation, part of the Fort Myer/McNair Military Community (FMMC). The proposed action and the no-action alternative have been reviewed in accordance with NEPA, as implemented by the regulations of the CEQ and AR 200-2. Baseline environmental and socioeconomic conditions at Fort Myer and the surrounding areas have been described and the environmental and socioeconomic consequences of implementing the proposed actions have been evaluated. A table summarizing the effects of the proposed action and the no-action alternative on environmental resources, as documented in detail in section 5.0, is provided below.

Table 6-1: Summary of Effects of the Proposed Action and the No-Action Alternative

Resource	Proposed Action	No-Action Alternative
Land Use	No Impact.	No Impact.
Geology	No Impact.	No Impact.
Soils	No Impact.	No Impact.
Topography and Drainage	No Impact.	No Impact.
Climate	No Impact.	No Impact.
Air Quality	No Impact.	No Impact.
Water Quality	No Impact.	No Impact.
Aquatic Resources and Wetlands	No Impact.	No Impact.
Vegetation	No Impact.	No Impact.
Wildlife Resources	No Impact.	No Impact.
Threatened and Endangered Species	No Impact.	No Impact.
Prime and Unique Farmlands	No Impact.	No Impact.
Wild and Scenic Rivers	No Impact.	No Impact.
Cultural Resources	No Impact.	No Impact.
Hazardous, Toxic and Radioactive Substances	No Impact.	No Impact.
Infrastructure	No Impact.	No Impact.
Solid Waste	No Impact.	No Impact.
Transportation	Temporary, minor impacts.	No Impact.
Economics	Minor impacts.	No Impact.
Public Health and Safety	No Impact.	No Impact.
Noise	No Impact.	No Impact.
Environmental Justice	No Impact.	No Impact.

Department of Defense (DoD) has directed and Department of the Army (DA) has issued implementing guidance to major commands and subordinate installations to pursue privatization of UDC systems as a prudent means to transfer the responsibility of ownership, and operation and maintenance of these systems to the non-Federal sector. Privatization of UDC systems is

envisioned as the means for the military services to obtain more efficient delivery of utility services and to be able to standardize maintenance and operation of these systems as commonly applicable and prescribed in the non-Federal sector. Fort Myer's aging UDC system infrastructure is in need of repair, upgrade and/or replacement. Through privatization of its UDC systems, the Government would be able to effect these infrastructure improvements as timely as possible. For these reasons, the Government is pursuing privatization of its Myer UDC systems at this time.

Selection of the no-action alternative, or not privatizing the Myer UDC systems, would not satisfy the need to provide capital improvements to those existing systems or portions of systems in poor condition. It would also not would it comply with DoD directives and DA policy to privatize UDC systems to the maximum extent. Therefore, the no-action alternative is not preferred.

Impacts to natural resources from implementing the proposed action would be expected to be minor, and be primarily associated with UDC systems infrastructure repair or replacement. Short-term impacts consisting of dust and emissions, soil disturbance, equipment noise and damage to vegetation can be expected within the utility line easements from the use of construction equipment. Implementing the proposed action would be expected to shorten the overall duration of construction activities that would have had to be performed by the Government to keep the UDC systems in satisfactory operation. As such, no long-term impact and, collectively, no significant impact on natural resources is anticipated.

Impacts to cultural resources from implementing the proposed action are likely to be minor, and temporary. No impacts would be expected to historic structures, as no infrastructure work would be performed within any building footprint. Ground disturbance, even within existing utility easements, has the potential for uncovering archaeological or historically significant artifacts. The non-Federal owner would be required to comply with all installation guidelines and procedures for managing and protecting cultural resources prior to initiating any excavation or other disturbance of ground. As such, no significant impacts are expected to the architectural, visual and aesthetic features within the overall Fort Myer listed and eligible historic district.

Impacts to socioeconomic conditions from implementing the proposed action would be expected to be minor, and associated with the potential loss of operations and maintenance personnel positions and minor impact of infrastructure construction expenditures. Privatization of the Myer UDC systems may result in the loss of up to six FTE personnel from the FMMC DPWL workforce. These individuals would be provided with job placement services available. Under ideal conditions, each individual would be able to find comparable employment with no break in pay or benefits. In less than ideal conditions, some individuals would not be able to find suitable employment within the severance period. This situation, however, is not permanent, and the cumulative economic impacts of temporary unemployment are not likely to be significant. Short-term increases in construction expenditures associated with infrastructure improvements on Fort Myer are not expected to represent a significant change in the local economy, considering the level of construction activity present and anticipated in the surrounding metropolitan area.

The implementation of the proposed action consists of transfer of ownership of Myer UDC systems, and transfer of responsibility to operate and maintain these systems, from the Federal Government to a non-Federal entity. Implementing the proposed action to privatize Myer UDC systems would not significantly alter baseline environmental or socioeconomic conditions. Because the proposed action would not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment, no environmental impact statement will be prepared, and a Finding of No Significant Impact will be published in accordance with 40 Code of Federal Regulations 1500 and Army Regulation 200-2.

7.0 REFERENCES

Fort Myer (1999). *Environmental Assessment, Barracks Renovation, Fort Myer, Arlington, Virginia*. Prepared by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District.

U.S. Army Military District of Washington (1991). *DRAFT Environmental Assessment, Existing Conditions Report, Fort Myer, Arlington County, Virginia.* Prepared by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District.

8.0 LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AAFES	Army-Air Force Exchange Service
ACM	Asbestos Containing Materials
ANC	Arlington National Cemetery
AR	Army Regulation
AST	Aboveground Storage Tank
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CRMP	Cultural Resource Management Plan
DEH	Department of Health
DoD	Department of Defense
DRID	Defense Reform Initiative Directive
EA	Environmental Assessment
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
FAR	Federal Acquisition Regulation
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIS	Flood Insurance Study
FNSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FTE	Full-Time-Equivalent
HDPE	High Density Poly-Ethylene
HTRS	Hazardous, Toxic and Radioactive Substances
HUD	United States Housing and Urban Development
LBP	Lead Based Paint
MDW	Military District of Washington
NCO	Non Commissioned Officer
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NESC	National Electric Safety Code
NHL	National Historic Landmark
NO_x	Nitrous Oxides
O_3	Ozone
OSHA	Occupational Safety Health Administration
PCB	Polychlorinated Biphenyls
Pci/L	Picocuries Per Liter
POC	Point of Contact
PVC	Poly-Vinyl Chloride
RMA	Resource Management Area
RPA	Resource Protection Area
RRRP	Resource Recovery and Recycling Program
SAV	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
TPY	Tons Per Year
UDC	Utility Distribution and Collection
USC	United States Code

USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USGS	United States Geological Survey
UST	Underground Storage Tank
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound
VP	Virginia Power